

In the claims:

Please, **replace** claims 1 and 15 with **amended** versions that read as follows:

1. (Amended) A method of inducing a T_H1 polarized immune response to an antigen, comprising parenterally administering to a subject microparticles sized such that at least 50% of the microparticles are at least 0.6 μm and a least 50% of the microparticles are less than 5 μm , the microparticles comprising the antigen entrapped or encapsulated by a biodegradable polymer.

15. (Amended) A vaccine formulation for enhancing the T_H1 immune response to at least one antigen and adapted for parenteral administration comprising a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and a pharmaceutically effective amount of microparticles sized such that at least 50% of the microparticles are at least 0.6 μm and at least 50% of the microparticles are less than 5 μm , the microparticles comprising the at least one antigen entrapped or encapsulated by a biodegradable polymer.

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15-20 are pending in this application.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Overview of Response

Applicants have amended the claims so that, consistent with the specification, the claims more clearly define what constitutes a population of microparticles for purposes of the present inventions. This clarification distinguishes microparticles from nanoparticles as understood by the specification. In the present application, surprising differences in immunological properties of nanoparticles and microparticles are identified by the inventor. No one had previously shown that such microparticle populations favor the induction of T_H1 responses whereas such nanoparticle populations favor the induction of T_H2 responses.

Support for Amendments

The central theme of the application is that microparticle populations have properties different from those of nanoparticles. Furthermore those differences reflect size differences between the two types of populations. (See for example, Claim 1 vs. Claim 7 in the application as filed; also Page 5, 3rd paragraph vs. 4th paragraph) The claims in the application as filed incompletely reflected this distinction. The claims set an upper limit (5 μ M) to the median size of a microparticle population, but failed to set a lower limit. As a result, the definition of a microparticle in the claims inadvertently extends low enough to include nanoparticle populations - contrary to the specification. The amendment corrects this omission by setting that